Document 28

Filed 05/22/2008 Page 1 of 3

tase 3:08-cv-01609-JSW

Division of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, are related.

DISCUSSION

These cases, ("<u>Haggarty</u>") and ("<u>Somerville</u>"), are essentially the same class action cases. The defendants in both cases are the same. The causes of action are the same. The transactions on which the allegations are based are the same. The only difference between the two cases is the identity of the named plaintiff.

Haggarty and Somerville each allege that the Stryker Defendants engaged in a kickback scheme with doctors and/or hospitals in order to promote the use of the Stryker Defendants' products in hip and knee replacement surgeries. Haggarty and Somerville each allege that the alleged kickback scheme was a violation of California Business & Professions Code section 16700 et seq. (the "Cartwright Act") and California Business & Professions Code section 17200. Haggarty and Somerville each seeks to represent the same class of individuals, i.e.:

All individuals who are, or at the relevant time were, residents of California who either were uninsured or had a private health care insurance policy pursuant to which they paid a percentage of the total costs of surgical procedures, and who had hip or knee implant surgery during the Class period that involved the use of Stryker products.

Compare Haggarty Complaint ¶ 31 with Somerville Complaint ¶ 33. Because the cases are essentially identical, there would be an unduly burdensome duplication of effort labor and expense and perhaps conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different Judges.

The Stryker Defendants, the plaintiff in this action, and the plaintiff in <u>Somerville</u> have stipulated that the cases are related and that <u>Somerville</u>, the later-filed case, should be reassigned to the Honorable Judge Spero pursuant to Local Rule 3-12(f)(3). *See* Stipulation to Consider Cases Related filed herewith.

///

///

	Case 3:08-cv-01609-JSW Document 28 Filed 05/2	2/2008	Page 3 of 3	
		2/2000	rage of or o	
1	CONCLUSION			
2	For the foregoing reasons, the Stryker Defendants, with the plaintiffs' stipulation, request			t
3	that the Court determine that the cases are related so that Clerk can reassign the Somerville case			
4	pursuant to Local Rule 3-12(f)(3).			
5		N TORR	ES & FRIEDMAN LLP	
6	6 And	IV TORK	ES & PRIEDMAN ELI	
7	7			
8	By: <u>/s/ William M. Goodman</u> WILLIAM M. GOODMAN			
9	STERN & KILCULLEN, LLC Joel M. Silverstein (Pro Hac Vice) Jeffrey Speiser (Pro Hac Vice) Michael Dinger (Pro Hac Vice) Attorneys for Defendants			
10				
11				
12				
13	According to Determinates			
14	14			
15	15			
16	16			
17	17			
18	18			
19	19			
20				
21	21			
22	22			